

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9, 11-38, and 40-50 were pending in the application. Claims 13-26 have been allowed. Claim 49 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 27, 38, 47, 48, and 50 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9, 11-38, 40-48, and 50 are now pending in the application.

On page 3 of the pending Office Action, the Examiner indicated that limitations drawn to "the shoulder and foot being configured such that the elongated body is spaced from the surface of the computer component" would be favorably considered. Applicant has amended claims 1, 27, 38, 47, 48, and 50 to include such limitations.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 27-38, and 40-50 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kump (U.S. Patent 6,341,755).

Applicant respectfully submits that Kump fails to teach or suggest "when each retaining foot is engaged to an opening in the surface of the rack-mounted computer system, each combination of a retaining foot and a shoulder ledge is configured such that the elongated body is spaced from the surface of the rack-mounted computer system" as recited in claim 1. In accordance, claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over Kump.

Claims 3-4, 7, 9, and 11-12 depend on independent claim 1 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Kump for at least the reasons given above.

Furthermore, independent claims 27, 47, 48, and 50 each recites features similar to those highlighted above with regard to independent claim 1 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Kump for at least the reasons given in the above paragraph discussing claim 1. Claims 28-37 depend on claim 27 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Kump for the same reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kump fails to teach or suggest "wherein the

combination of the shoulder ledge and at least one retaining foot is configured to limit motion of the label holder such that the elongated body maintains a predetermined spaced distance from the surface of the rack-mounted computer system component during use" as recited in claim 38. In accordance, claim 38 is believed to patentably distinguish over Kump.

Claims 40-46 depend on independent claim 38 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Kump for at least the reasons given above.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-02600/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 8-18-04